

APPLICATION NO.

09/818,727

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
E-988	1337

PAPER NUMBER

919 7590 07/13/2004
PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

FILING DATE

03/27/2001

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Ronald P. Sansone

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	09/818,727	SANSONE, RON	IALD P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	11/	
	Jamisue A. Webb	3629	M4	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10) \boxtimes The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 March 2001</u> is/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attackmant/a				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗌 Int	terview Summary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Pa	per No(s)/Mail Date	TO 452)	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040621,20040430. 20040123, 20040123,	,	otice of Informal Patent Application (Pinher:	10-152)	
200/0327	-/			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
 - claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. With respect to Claims 1 and 6: the preamble of the claim states "a method for determining the location of a missing person", yet the claim does not recite any steps of determining the location, it only gives a list of people that are "likely" to be the missing person, therefore only claims a method to aid in the location of a missing person. The body of the claim does not achieve what the preamble says the method do is for.
- 4. Claims 1 and 6 recite the limitation "the name" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
- 5. Claims 1 and 6 recite the limitation "the carrier" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. With respect to Claims 1 and 6: the phrase "scanning mail faces that have been deposited with the carrier by a sender" is indefinite. It is unclear to the examiner if "a sender" is any sender that sends mail through the specific carrier, or is the sender one of the parties that is likely to receive mail from or send mail to the missing person.
- 7. With respect to Claims 1 and 6: the phrase "producing a list of scanned names and addresses" is indefinite. It is unclear to the examiner if this list is produced from the scanned images, and is the list just a bunch of images, or are they actual

characters/letters/words? Is there some form of character recognition step that converts the image to characters to produce this list?

- 8. Claims 1 and 6 recite the limitation "the list" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Is this the list of parties, or the list of scanned names and addresses?
- 9. With respect to Claims 1 and 6: the phrase "to determine if the missing person is the recipient or sender of mail that is likely to be the missing person" is indefinite. The sentence appears to be grammatically incorrect and reads that the mail is likely to be the missing person. Therefore it is unclear what this phrase is trying to do or accomplish, other than reviewing the delivered list.
- 10. Claims 2 and 7 recite the limitation "the likely person" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Claims 1 and 6 recite a list of likely people, therefore it is unclear who "the" likely person is. Furthermore it is unclear how this is being verified and who is doing the verification.
- 11. Claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 recite the limitation "the recipient" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Is this the recipient of the mail or of the list?
- 12. Claims 5 and 10 recites the limitation "the mail face" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Previously the claim recites multiple mail faces, therefore it is unclear which mail face this is referring to.
- 13. With respect to Claims 5 and 10: the phrase "delivering a reproduction of the scanned image" is indefinite. It is unclear who this is being delivered to, and

furthermore, there is more than one scanned image, therefore it is unclear what this is referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

14. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis for this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claims 1-10 only recite an abstract idea. The recited steps of merely scanning mail and determine if the canned mail includes names then producing a list of names and addresses, does not apply, involve, use or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user, by the naked eye or by use of a pen and paper. These steps only constitute an idea of how to produce a list of likely names and addresses of a missing person.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present case, the claimed invention produces a list of likely names and addresses of a missing person (i.e., useful and tangible).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above, claims 1-10 are deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sestrom et al. (6,647,385) discloses the use of scanning mail and updating address databases, Bruce et al. (6,741,724) discloses the use of a method using an OCR system, Koga et al, (2001/0021261) discloses the use of an method and machine for mail scanning and sorting, McKeen, Jr. (4,037,956) discloses the use of verified mail system, Corvari et al (CA 1178711) discloses the use of an apparatus to scan and analyze mail for address information, Carnivore FAQ (www.robertgraham.com) discloses the use of a system used by the FBI that tracks and monitor's e-mail addresses, Wattendorf (Dialog reference 04717583) discloses the use of surveillance strategies, Pace (Dialog reference 13562569) discloses the use of monitoring mail and privacy issues, People Finder (www.peoplefindernow.com) discloses the use of different strategies used to find missing people.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamisue A. Webb whose telephone number is (703) 308-8579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 - 4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jamisue Webb

JOHN G. WEISS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

ger. I